

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration of this application is requested. Claims 16-31 remain in the application. New claims 32-39 have been added. Claims 16 and 24 have been amended to include the step of using information in the storage device to reconfigure interface settings in the host computing device and to delete the requirement for particular types of solid-state memory and the step of retrieving personal information. The reconfiguration feature is described in the application on page 18, at lines 4-12. This feature is also included in new claim 33, and claims 34-39 that depend from claim 33. Claims 22, 23 and 31 have been editorially amended.

In the Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, claims 16, 19-24, 27-31 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 5-11 and 13-18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,629,193. This rejection is traversed through the amendments of claims 16 and 24 to include using information in the storage device to reconfigure the host computing device.

It should be noted that the use of information in the storage device to reconfigure the host computing device is described in the U.S. Patent No. 6,629,193, at column 7, line 55 through column 8, line 3. The Applicant is the inventor of U.S. Patent No. 6,629,193, which issued after the filing date of the present application.

In Section 1 of the Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, the title of the invention has been objected to as not being descriptive. The title of the application has been amended to conform to the amended claims.

In Section 2 of the Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, the disclosure has been objected to because of an informality on page 2, lines 18-19. This objection has been addressed through an amendment to the specification.

In Section 3 of the Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, claim 24 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the application regards as the invention. This rejection is traversed through the above editorial changes

to claim 24. Since claims 25-31 depend from claim 24, those changes similarly address the rejection of claims 25-31.

In Section 4 of the Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, claims 16 and 19-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Minne' (U.S. Patent No. 6,404,647).

This rejection is traversed through the amendment of claim 16 to include using information in the storage device to reconfigure interface settings in the host computing device. As stated in the application on page 15, at lines 5-16, a user's interface preferences can be included in the storage device such that, upon initial reading of the storage device, the host computing device settings will be reconfigured to emulate the user's preferred interface settings. For instance, where the computing device is running a WINDOWS<sup>®</sup> system, the "desktop" shown on the display can be reconfigured to an orientation with which the user is familiar. Once the user's preferred settings have been assumed, information can be accessed in a conventional manner. Due to the reconfiguration of the interface settings, the user can quickly and easily access and use the information stored on the storage device. In addition, the user can further access the Internet and his or her email accounts, if any. In other words, the user can utilize the foreign computing device as simply and easily as his or her own PC to access and use personal information. This feature is neither disclosed nor suggested by Minne'.

In Section 7 of the Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, claim 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minne' (US 6,404,647) as applied to claim 16 and further in view of Deo et al. (US 5,721,781).

The Office Action states that Minne' does not disclose expressly personal information comprising either account information or medical information. However, Deo et al. was cited as disclosing card storing medical information (column 4, lines 65-67) and account information (column 5, lines 1-4).

Minne' and Deo et al. were considered to be analogous art because Minne' and Deo et al. form the same field of endeavor, namely storing personal information and this would allow for personal information consisting of either medical information or

account information. It was considered to have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the specific types or personal information such as medical information or account information of Deo et al. into the system of Minne', to provide greater versatility to the system of Minne' ([customized to fit in other specific applications] Minne' - column 3, lines 60-66).

Since claim 17 depends from claim 16, this rejection is traversed for the reasons set forth above with respect to the traversal of the rejection of claim 16.

In Section 8 of the Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minne' (US 6,404,647) as applied to claim 16 and in further view of Wright et al. (US 2002/0046061).

The Office Action states that Minne' does not disclose expressly personal information comprising storing a user medical history including at least one of X-ray images and test results. However, Wright et al. was cited as disclosing personal data on a personal information system storing medical history, x-ray images, and lab reports (paragraph [0013]).

Minne' and Wright et al. were considered to be analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely storing personal information. At the time of the invention it was considered to have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the personal data containing medical history, x-ray images, and lab reports of Wright et al. into the system of Minne'.

Since claim 18 depends from claim 16, this rejection is traversed for the reasons set forth above with respect to the traversal of the rejection of claim 16.

In Section 9 of the Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, claim 22 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Minne' (US 6,404,647) as applied to claim 16 and in further view of Vogt et al. (US 2004/0078511).

The Office Action states that Minne' does not disclose partitioning the personal information so that a portion of the information can be accessed without a password or personal identification number and another portion of the information

requires a password or personal identification number to access the stored information. However, Vogt et al. was cited as disclosing a Main Flash array 105 that may be accessed without a password and a hidden storage that may only be accessed via access control (figure 1; column 2, paragraph [0015]).

Minne' and Vogt et al. were considered to be analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely storage devices. At the time of the invention it was considered to have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the access controlled hidden storage along and the Main Array without access control of Vogt et al. into the system of Minne'.

Since claim 22 depends from claim 16, this rejection is traversed for the reasons set forth above with respect to the traversal of the rejection of claim 16.

In Section 10 of the Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, claim 23 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Minne' (US 6,404,647) as applied to claim 16 and in further view of Saliba (US 5,894,425).

The Office Action states that Minne' does not disclose expressly interfacing the storage device with the host computing device via a wireless communication. However, Saliba was cited as disclosing interfacing a storage device with a host computer via wireless communication (column 1, lines 5-10).

Minne' and Saliba were considered to be analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely storage devices. At the time of the invention it was considered to have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the wireless interface of Saliba into the system of Minne'.

Since claim 23 depends from claim 16, this rejection is traversed for the reasons set forth above with respect to the traversal of the rejection of claim 16.

In Section 11 of the Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, claims 24, 27-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Minne' (US 6,404,647) in view of Vogt et al. The Office Action states that Minne' does not disclose expressly partitioning the personal information stored on the at least one memory device so that a portion of the information can be accessed without a password or

personal identification number and another portion of information requires a password or personal identification number to access the stored information. However, Vogt et al. was cited as disclosing a storage device with a Main Flash array being accessed without a password and a hidden storage area that can only be accessed via access control, (column 2, paragraph [0015]; figure 1).

Minne' and Vogt et al. were considered to be analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely storage devices. At the time of the invention it was considered to have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the access controlled hidden storage and the Main Array without access control of Vogt et al. into the system of Minne'.

This rejection is traversed through the amendment of claim 24 to include using information in the storage device to reconfigure interface settings in the host computing device. As stated in the application on page 15, at lines 5-16, a user's interface preferences can be included in the storage device such that, upon initial reading of the storage device, the host computing device settings will be reconfigured to emulate the user's preferred interface settings. For instance, where the computing device is running a WINDOWS® system, the "desktop" shown on the display can be reconfigured to an orientation with which the user is familiar. Once the user's preferred settings have been assumed, information can be accessed in a conventional manner. Due to the reconfiguration of the interface settings, the user can quickly and easily access and use the information stored on the storage device. In addition, the user can further access the Internet and his or her email accounts, if any. In other words, the user can utilize the foreign computing device as simply and easily as his or her own PC to access and use personal information. This feature is neither disclosed nor suggested by Minne'.

In regard to claim 27, Minne' discloses a desirable amount of storage can be obtained even if space is very limited [Column 8, Lines 61-65], the mass memory storage device (10) being used to provide the level of storage redundancy previously available only from a plurality of disks in a limited amount of space [Column 4, Lines

40-44], and the mass memory storage device (10) to provide a substantially larger capacity of data storage than can conventional disk drives [Column 4, Lines 58-60].

Since claim 27 depends from claim 24, the rejection of claim 27 is traversed for the reasons set forth above with respect to the traversal of the rejection of claim 24.

In regard to claim 28, Minne' was cited as disclosing a desirable amount of storage can be obtained even if space is very limited [Column 8, Lines 61-65], the mass memory storage device (10) being used to provide the level of storage redundancy previously available only from a plurality of disks in a limited amount of space [Column 4, Lines 40-44], and the mass memory storage device (10) to provide a substantially larger capacity of data storage than can conventional disk drives [Column 4, Lines 58-60].

Since claim 28 depends from claim 24, the rejection of claim 28 is traversed for the reasons set forth above with respect to the traversal of the rejection of claim 24.

In regard to claim 29, Minne' was cited as disclosing the mass memory storage device (10) having a 3.5 inch, 2.5 inch, 1.8 inch, or 1.0 inch form factor and the mass memory storage device (10) being sized and customized to fit in specific applications such as handheld computing devices and mobile telephones [Column 3, Lines 51-64].

Since claim 29 depends from claim 24, the rejection of claim 29 is traversed for the reasons set forth above with respect to the traversal of the rejection of claim 24.

In regard to claim 30, Minne' was cited as disclosing a mass storage device 10 implemented with high-density atomic resolution storage (ARS) (Fig. 4-6; Column 4, Lines 63-66) and a mass storage device 10 implemented with high-density magnetic random access memory (MRAM) (Column 7-8; Column 7, Lines 53-59).

Since claim 30 depends from claim 24, the rejection of claim 30 is traversed for the reasons set forth above with respect to the traversal of the rejection of claim 24.

In Section 12 of the Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, claim 25 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minne' (US 6,404,647) in view of Vogt et al. as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Deo et al.

The Office Action states that Minne' and Vogt et al. do not disclose expressly storing information comprises storing at least one of contact information, scheduling information, account information, medical information, application files, entertainment features, photographs, Internet settings and favorites, computer applications, and interface preferences. However, Deo et al. was cited as disclosing card storing medical information (column 4, lines 65-67) and account information (column 5, lines 1-4).

Minne' and Vogt et al. and Deo et al. were considered to be analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely storage devices. According to the Office Action, at the time of the invention it was considered to have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the specific types of personal information such as medical information or account information of Deo et al. into the system of Minne' and Vogt et al.

Since claim 25 depends from claim 24, the rejection of claim 25 is traversed for the reasons set forth above with respect to the traversal of the rejection of claim 24.

In Section 13 of the Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, claim 26 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minne' (US 6,404,647) in view of Vogt et al. as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Wright et al.

The Office Action states that Minne' and Vogt et al. do not disclose expressly storing information comprises storing a user medical history including at least

one of X-ray images and test results. However, Wright et al. was cited as disclosing personal data on a personal information system storing medical history, x-ray images, and lab reports (paragraph [0013]).

Minne' and Vogt et al. and Wright et al. were considered to be analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely storing personal information. According to the Office Action, at the time of the invention it was considered to have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the personal data containing medical history, x-ray images, and lab reports of Wright et al. into the system of Minne' and Vogt et al.

Since claim 26 depends from claim 24, the rejection of claim 26 is traversed for the reasons set forth above with respect to the traversal of the rejection of claim 24.

In Section 14 of the Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, claim 31 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minne' (US 6,404,647) in view of Vogt et al. as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Saliba.

The Office Action states that Minne' and Vogt et al. do not disclose expressly interfacing the storage device with the host computing device comprises interfacing the storage device with the host computing device via a wireless communication. However, Saliba was cited as disclosing interfacing a storage device with a host computer via wireless communication (column 1, lines 5-10).

Minne' and Vogt et al. and Saliba were considered to be analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely storage devices. According to the Office Action, at the time of the invention it was considered to have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the wireless interface of Saliba into the system of Minne' and Vogt et al.

Since claim 31 depends from claim 24, the rejection of claim 31 is traversed for the reasons set forth above with respect to the traversal of the rejection of claim 24.



All claims in the application are believed to be in allowable form.  
Allowance of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

*Robert P Lenart*

Robert P. Lenart  
Reg. No. 30,654  
Pietragallo, Bosick & Gordon LLP  
One Oxford Centre, 38<sup>th</sup> Floor  
301 Grant Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
Telephone: 412-263-4399  
Facsimile: 412-261-0915  
Attorney for Applicant